D. Kruisheer, 'Theodore bar Koni's *Ktābā d-'Eskolyon* as a Source for the Study of Early Mandaeism', *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"* (Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society "Ex Oriente Lux") 33 (1993-1994), 151-169.

THEODORE BAR KONI'S *KᵉTĀBĀ D-'ESKOLYON* AS A SOURCE FOR THE STUDY OF EARLY MANDAEISM*

DIRK KRUISHEER (AMSTERDAM)

Theodore bar Koni, a teacher in the East Syrian School at Kashkar in Central Mesopotamia, is known to be the author of the *Kᵉtābā d-'eskolyon* ('Book of Scholion *or* Scholia'). In the eleventh and last part (*mēmrā)* of his work he gives a detailed description of all the heresies known to him at that time, i.e., the last decade of the eighth century[1]). The structure and wording of *mēmrā* XI are ample evidence that Bar Koni made use of a translation of the *Anakephalaiōsis,* an excerpt from the *Panarion* of Epiphanius. The *Panarion* itself dates back to the eighties of the fourth century. The text, however, which is found in Bar Koni's work was edited and supplemented, initially, of course, by the redactor of the *Anakephalaiōsis*, and later probably by the Syriac translator, who was not Bar Koni himself (Pognon 1898:106-8). As Gerö notes, in *mēmrā* XI there appears to be no mention of persons or historical events that can be dated after the fifth century. It is uncertain, therefore, whether the additional material — in which *mēmrā* XI differs substantially from the *Panarion* and the *Anakephalaiōsis* — dates from an earlier period or whether it came into existence later on, i.e., at some time between c. 500 and c. 800, in the Syriac-speaking area[2]).

On the subject of the sources of Bar Koni's *mēmrā* XI and their reliability we find a number of incidental references scattered throughout the scholarly literature. There is a strong tendency not to take *mēmrā* XI too seriously as a source for the history of religion, with the exception of the excerpt from the *Panarion*[3]). Gerö has recently

* I would like to thank Prof. Dr. L. Van Rompay for his enthusiastic support and his practical help in preparing this article. Drs. Barbara Fasting commented on my English in a most generous way.

[1]) S. Griffith, Theodore Bar Kônî's *Scholion*: A Nestorian *Summa Contra Gentiles* from the First Abbasid Century, in: N. G. Garsoïan *et al.* (eds), *East of Byzantium. Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Dumbarton Oaks, Washington 1982) 53f., 57-60. Griffith provides a comprehensive review of the *Kᵉtābā d-'eskolyon* and a reconstruction of the intellectual milieu in which it was conceived. The edition of the *Kᵉtābā d-'eskolyon* used for this article is that of Scher 1912. Translations of the eleventh *mēmrā* are also found in Pognon 1898:159-232 (where parts of the Syriac text were also published for the first time), and in Hespel and Draguet 1982:213-262.

[2]) Cf. Gerö 1987:266. Gerö's conjecture that the whole of *mēmrā* XI is a sixth-century Syriac *opusculum,* reproduced by Bar Koni, is discussed in the conclusion of this article.

[3]) W. Strothmann, *Kohelet-Kommentar des Johannes von Apamea* (Göttinger Orientforschungen 1, 30; Wiesbaden 1988) XVIII-XIX gives a summary of the scholarly discussion. The different arguments which he adduces against the historical value of *mēmrā* XI are very uneven. The section which concerns us here is not explicitly mentioned by Strothmann.

advocated the use of the additional material in *mēmrā* XI as an important source for the description of what he provisionally designates as Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosticism. He provides an example in his detailed study of Bar Koni's description of the heresy of the *Ḥewyāyē,* the serpent-worshippers (Gerö 1987:266).

The purpose of the present article is to examine another passage in *mēmrā* XI, which deals with the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Nerigaeans (Scher 1912: 342:6-347:21). This text, too, displays a range of well-known Gnostic images, myths, and names. Therefore, parallels will be adduced from Mandaic literature, tradition, and language. It will be argued that the section in which Bar Koni describes these various sects constitutes a unity. In addition, historical significance will be attached to Bar Koni's statement that one name used to refer to them was 'Mandaeans'; it will be maintained that Central Mesopotamia, Bar Koni's own country, which borders on the region where the Mandaeans lived (and still live), was the place of origin.

I. Theodore bar Koni on the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Nerigaeans

Bar Koni's description of the three sects can easily be isolated from its context by the occurrence of the words 'the stupid Kantaeans' at the beginning and at the end of the text, thus providing a formal *inclusio.* The text is preceded by an entry on Julian of Halicarnassus, presented as the teacher of Severus of Antioch, and concludes with a section on the people of Rahmuta. Neither the content nor the structure of these two entries has any connection with the body of the text. A translation of the text, together with notes on the Mandaisms which it contains, is given at the end of this article and will serve as the basis for the discussion. Section numbers (in bold face) have been added to facilitate reference. The general commentary below is followed by an attempt at a structural overview. In the concluding section, the results are recapitulated and discussed.

§ 1a. Goliath and the Philistines

As Bar Koni states in his opening sentence, all that follows with reference to the Kantaeans, that is, the stories about Goliath, the Philistines and their exile in Babylon, serves to refute the Kantaeans' own claim that they are descended from Abel. Before going into these stories, it may be helpful to consider the consequences of Bar Koni's statement. In the first place, the name of Abel is recorded here at the outset, and will be mentioned again in sections 5 and 6. Obviously, Bar Koni cannot deny the three sects the important role that Abel plays in their religion, however much he would like to. Abel is a prominent figure as a light being and as the demiurge in Mandaean cosmology, too[4]). It is possible that the historical Kantaeans, like

[4]) *Gy* 12:2-13:15 and 32:17-34:13 (The abbreviations *Gy* and *Gs* indicate the right (*yamina*) and the left (*smala*) sections of the *Ginza.* Page and line numbers refer to: H. Petermann (ed.), *Thesaurus s. Liber Magnus vulgo "Liber Adami" appelatus,* vol. 1-2 (Leipzig 1867)).

the Dostaeans and the Mandaeans, were indeed worshippers of Abel. In the second place, Bar Koni's determination to withhold Abel from the Kantaeans may have tempted him to invent the stories about Goliath and the Philistines.

Bar Koni replaces Abel with Goliath, the uncircumcised Philistine and, in so doing, identifies the Kantaeans with the Philistines. As there is no historical evidence about the Philistines' being led into captivity, it would seem that the story is no more than an exercise in polemics. Reading it as a caricature of Passion would serve this purpose well. The hero's death is celebrated, not as part of God's plan, but as the outcome of base and human cunning. It is not victory in or over death which is focussed upon, but human and unworthy defeat. The early history of the Kantaeans is placed within the framework of biblical history; however, they are included among the enemies of God and Israel.

Just as in the biblical story Nebuchadnezzar destroyed the temple in Jerusalem, Bar Koni has him destroy the statue of Goliath. The Philistines are led into captivity and must do their best to carry out their religious duties in a foreign land. Idol-worshipping is ridiculed in a description of an absurd ritual.

§ 1b. The Nergalites and Bar Koni's chronological information

The last paragraph of section 1 contains information of a different nature. After the fantastic story about Goliath and the Philistines, Bar Koni gives us certain specific facts. The Chaldeans, he says, named the Kantaeans after Nergal. The third and last sect he describes, in section 6, is named after Nerig, which is a shorter form of Nergal (Pognon o.c. 228 n. 1). Bar Koni was clearly not aware of this fact and provides the name Nerig with a Syriac etymology. In the discussion of section 6 below, additional details are given that make it possible to identify the Kantaeans / Nergalites with the Nerigaeans.

Another important detail is the chronological information that is supplied in the mention of the reigns of Yazdgard II (439-457) and Peroz (459-484), the only instance of a fixed date in our text. The period covered by Batay's ministry links up with that of Peroz's successor Balash. According to Michael the Syrian it was under the four-year reign of Balash that 'the heresy of the Kantaeans and of the worthless Dostaeans appeared in Persia'[5]).

§ 2. About Batay, where he came from

Of all the persons described in our text, Batay has the best historical claims. Originally from Gaukay, he lived during the reign of Peroz, and was a reformer of his religion. He borrowed ideas and rituals from the Jews, the Manichaeans and the Christians. In addition to Michael's chronological indication, the *Ginza* refers to an

[5]) J. -B. Chabot (ed. and transl.), *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199),* vol. 1-4 (Paris 1901-24) vol. 2: 151, 151 n. 1; vol. 4: 255. Cf. Pognon o.c. 11f., 12 n. 1, 246f.

apostate who placed the Cross on the left shoulder of his disciples[6]). Gaukay, too, is mentioned in the *Ginza,* and described as the land that will exchange places with Babylonia in the fifty years preceding the end of the world[7]). Gaukay is situated between the Tigris and the Persian border and this may be an indication of the Persian origin of Batay (Pognon o.c. 9 n. 2).

A leader or founder of a sect who comes out of slavery and creates his doctrine by stealing from others, would appear to be one of Bar Koni's *topoi*. The description of Mani is similarly structured[8]). In addition, Batay is presented as an apostate of his own religion.

§ 3a. The creation myth of the Kantaeans

Bar Koni's reproduction of Batay's doctrine in the first paragraph of this section bears all the authentic features of the Gnostic myth:

1. Out of the One arises a division between Good and Evil.
2. Both principles descend in multiple lowly powers. A cosmic conflict breaks out.
3. The evil powers carry off the divine soul, or spark, and shut it up in the flesh and in the material world.
4. The conclusion is that the creation of the world and of mankind was a mistake, or at least, that it took place against the will of the One and Most High (Jonas 1963:42-47).

The creation myth of the Dostaeans in section 5 follows these same lines.

A feature of a more specific nature is the use of the numbers seven and twelve, corresponding with the seven planets and the twelve zodiacal signs, for the evil powers. Together, they rule over creation. The multiplicity of heavens or 'spheres' gives expression to the distance between God and man, or the different stages of 'devolution' (Jonas o.c. 43; 236f.).

At this point, and further on in the description of the doctrine of the Dostaeans in section 5, we find words, or special uses of words, that are unknown in Classical Syriac. Many of these are Mandaisms, and Bar Koni seems to expect his readers to understand them without explanation. These Mandaisms are discussed in the notes accompanying the translation.

§ 3b. The Son of Light

It would appear that thus far Bar Koni has used his own formulations. In the last paragraph of section 3, however, he quotes almost verbatim from the *Ginza* (*Gs* 87:22-88:21). This paragraph also shows the influence of the Mandaic lexicon, and the Mandaizing use of the verb *šw'* ('to make') in section 3a may mark the

---

[6]) *Gy* 222:17f. Cf. Pognon o.c. 247 n. 1.
[7]) *Gy* 386:24. Cf. Pognon o.c. 8-10. This episode is also referred to in section 5.
[8]) Ed. Scher o.c. 311:12-313:9 (based on Epiphanius); transl. Hespel and Draguet o.c. 232f.

transition. The quotation of the hymn of the Son of Light has been dealt with by Pognon in his pioneering work (Pognon o.c. 233-244). Here I will confine myself to a few remarks on the impact it might have made on Bar Koni's Christian audience as well as on the question of what might have led Bar Koni to include it in his description.

The term 'Son of Light' would have been taken by Christians as a reference to Christ. The hymn would then describe His descent into hell, where wailing souls demand Him to ask His Father about their fate. In reply, He prophesies the drying up of the rivers, the lifeblood of the country, as a sign of the approaching day of judgement. The only novel elements in these words would then be the name 'Son of Light' for Christ and the image of the dry river beds. What could have made it appear so heretical in the eyes of Bar Koni and his audience? I can think only of two details, one present and one absent, that reflect a world view opposed to the Christian concept of divine economy. First, in this interpretation of the hymn the world is equated either with hell, or a place of suffering from which one must escape. Second, there is no mention of a moral condition under which the end of time will take place, neither repentance nor the measure of the fathers being full. Admittedly, observations of this sort demand some close reading, and there is no indication that Bar Koni ever expected his work to be examined in this way.

§ 4a. Ado's biography

Like the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans are attested in the writings of Bar Koni and Michael the Syrian only (see n. 5). At first glance, Bar Koni seems to be presenting Ado as the founder of their sect and as the instigator of the heresy itself. He does not make this explicit, however, telling us only that Ado taught their heresy. As in the case of Batay, Ado is more like a reformer or a missionary. Later on, we see that the Dostaeans did not take his name, and section 5 is not introduced as *his* doctrine[9]).

The biographical data on Ado are concrete and are worded in Classical Syriac, giving the impression that Bar Koni is speaking as an eyewitness. But the names which he uses for Ado's family must have been taken from some literary source, for a number of them are familiar from Mandaic literature, where they are given to heavenly beings. Shamlay is Mandaic *šylm'y*, Nadbay is *nydb'y*, Barhayye is *brhyy'* ('Son of Life') and Shetel *šytyl* ('Seth the god') (Pognon o.c. 11). In addition, the name Kushti (or Kushtay) refers to Mandaic *kwšṭ'*, 'truth', an important concept in Mandaean myth, which is often personified[10]). The name of Ado's mother also bears this element: Emkushta, 'Mother of Truth'. Outside of these fictional elements,

[9]) Pognon o.c. 11f. calls him '[le] fondateur de leur secte', and dates him long after Batay, arguing that the doctrine of the Dostaeans is said to be derived in part from the Kantaeans.

[10]) Cf. W. Sundberg, *Kushṭa. A Monograph on a Principal Word in Mandaean Texts* (Lund 1953) 42-54.

Ado's life is depicted as anything but heroic. This suggests that his biography, which is unrelated to the continuation of the description, was not intended as a historical account of the origins of the sect, but served primarily to ridicule the Dostaeans. Bar Koni does so with a great deal of verve.

§ 4b. Other names for the Dostaeans and the contents of their doctrine

The structure of section 4 is similar to that of section 1. Here, too, the fictional part is followed by a few lines of matter-of-fact information. In the last paragraph, Bar Koni makes a clear distinction between the geographical origins of the different names of the sect. The first three names are used in Mayshan, the initial one being that of the Mandaeans. This name is still used by the members of the sect today[11]). It is an adjectival derivation of *m'nd'*, which probably means 'knowledge' or 'gnosis'; however, we know that *m'nd'* also came to designate the cult hut[12]). The name Mashkenaeans, in any case, is derived from the place of worship; Mandaic *m'škn'* (Syriac *maškᵉnā*) means 'dwelling', 'temple'. The third name in use in Mayshan gives no new insights, but neither is it a problem: '(the people) of the house of him who does good things'.

The second trio of names tells us a bit more about Bar Koni's material and how he presented it. It seems unlikely that the first name was meant to be vocalized as *nāṣrāyē*, for then it would probably have been interpreted as 'Christians' by Bar Koni's audience[13]). Mandaic *n'ṣwr'yy'* ('observers'), on the other hand, is one of the older names which the Mandaeans used for themselves, and is still used for the Mandaean priests (Rudolph 1978:1). I believe that the very ambivalence of this detail favours the authenticity of Bar Koni's information. The second designation, '(the people) of the house of Dosti', is an alternative for the 'Dostaeans' in the heading of this section, a name also attested by Michael the Syrian (see n. 5). With all the information now at our disposal, Bar Koni's insistence on calling them Adonaeans continues to intrigue us. There is no indication that Ado played an active role in the formulation of the Dostaean doctrine, nor that he was an actual leader, as in the case of Batay.

In anticipation of the next section, Bar Koni mentions the sects from which the Dostaeans derived their doctrine: the Marcionites, the Manichaeans, and the Kantaeans. The three of them all have an entry in *mēmrā* XI[14]). What they have in

---

[11]) For a relatively recent report, see Rudolph 1978:1 and also the preface to Macuch 1965.

[12]) A summary of the discussion about the meaning and derivation of *m'nd'* is found in Rudolph 1960:114 n. 5.

[13]) But still 'Christians' in a pejorative sense. See S. Brock, Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac, in: A. Dietrich (ed.), *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (Abhandl. der Akad. der Wissensch. in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, III, 96; Göttingen 1975) 91-95, esp. 94f.

[14]) Marcionites: ed. Scher o.c. 304:4-23, transl. Hespel and Draguet o.c. 277; Manichaeans: ed. Scher o.c. 311:12-313:9, transl. Hespel and Draguet o.c. 232f.

common in these accounts is either that they are based on Christianity, like the Marcionites, or incorporated Christian elements into their doctrine or ritual, like the Manichaeans and the Kantaeans. Moreover, the Marcionites and the Manichaeans are the prime examples of heretics, and do not need a reason to be invoked. The explicit connection Bar Koni makes with the Kantaeans is more interesting. This may be an additional indication that the myths of the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Mandaeans — which are so similar in content — are indeed historically interrelated.

§ 5a. The creation myth of the Dostaeans

Here Bar Koni again switches to a non-classical, largely Mandaizing Syriac. No explanations are given, but he introduces one word ('baptism', in section 5b) as idiomatic. The contents and some of the names are familiar from Mandaic literature, notably from the *Ginza*. First, the creation is related in familiar Mandaean fashion. To quote Pognon:

> 'Nous trouvons dans le *Ginza* plusieurs récits de la création du monde qui ne concordent pas complètement les uns avec les autres, mais on peut les résumer tous ainsi: Abatour chargea son fils Ptahil de créer le monde; Ptahil exécuta mal les ordres d'Abatour; il fut, pour ce motif, condamné par lui à être enchaîné jusqu'à la fin du monde, et Hibil [Abel] vint terminer l'œuvre de Ptahil'[15]).

The last part of the creation myth, dealing with the talking brick and Christ, is also paralleled in the *Ginza*:

> 'And it will come to pass that the false Christ will come and will be lord over the entire world. And he will sit on a big throne and on it he will pass judgement, and the judges he will remove. He will come from the East to the West in one day, before the brick from the foundation testifies about him'[16]).

A concept of creation that was the result of an awkward mistake, committed through disobedience, would clearly have been considered offensive.

§ 5b. The hymn

In the last paragraph of the section about the doctrine of the Dostaeans, Bar Koni quotes another piece of literature. This passage is found only in *mēmrā* XI, but it contains certain elements which also appear elsewhere. The names of Hamgay and Hamgagay are familiar from Mandaic literature[17]). Such pairs of names seem to be constructed from an existing name by adding or deleting a syllable, often by way of

---

[15]) Pognon o.c. 7. For an example he refers to *Gy* 241:23-242:5. Bar Koni's version is the most elaborate.

[16]) *Gy* 386:22-387:7, quoted by Pognon o.c. 8-10. In this passage Gaukay, the native country of Batay, is also mentioned.

[17]) *Gy* 314:6; J. Euting (ed.), *Qolasta oder Gesänge und Lehren von der Taufe und dem Ausgang der Seele* (Stuttgart 1867) 2:25. Cf. Pognon o.c. 244.

reduplication. This is seen in such pairs as Ani and Nani, Bel and Belti, Diq and Mardiq and perhaps Emma and Mammani.

The first actions of the sorceresses are said to have taken place prior to the creation of Adam. Once Adam appears on the stage, he must serve them and later has to be rescued by Abel, who baptizes him; this event is seen as the institution of baptismal practice by the present-day Mandaeans (Rudolph 1961:94). In addition, the word for baptism (*mṣbw'yt'*) is virtually the same as the Mandaic *terminus technicus*, and Bar Koni introduces it as a foreign word ('what they call baptism'). Finally, Dinanos and Ditsa Zuta both appear in the *Ginza* as *dyn'nwkt s'pr' w-h'kym' s'pr' dywt' ḏ-'l'hy'* ('Dinanukt the scribe and sage, the ink book of the gods') and as *dyṣ' zwṭ'* ('Little Ditsa')[18]).

§ 6. The heresy of the Nerigaeans

In the description of the Nerigaeans, it is as if Bar Koni is deliberately bringing together facts and lines discernable in the contents of the foregoing account. A conspicuous element is the threefold division which dictates the overall structure, and which is seen first in the appearance of a third sect, almost by way of an appendix. As noted in the discussion of section 1, Pognon has pointed out that Nergal and Nerig are two forms of the same name. This observation, and the fact that both sects appear in the same context, suggests that the Kantaeans and the Nerigaeans are to be identified in more than one respect. Indeed, the rite performed by the sons of Cain is reminiscent of the Mandaean *laupa* ('communion'), the ritual meal for the dead. Among other things, it serves to strengthen the souls of the dead. Together with baptism, the *laupa* plays a central role in Mandaean daily life, which up to now has not been mentioned by Bar Koni[19]).

The remaining information which Bar Koni supplies must be viewed in the light of its literary function. Cain and Seth complete the trio of brothers, Abel having been mentioned earlier. The Syriac etymology for Nerig's name explains the association of Cain with the ritual meal, and validates Cain's appearance. The reference to Seth, the third and last of the brothers, makes it possible to end with the words that opened the story: Abel, who was denied to the Kantaeans, is now granted to the sons of Seth. In addition, the name of the Kantaeans is attributed to the 'Kanta'[20]), and finally the repetition of the words 'the stupid Kantaeans' conclude the account.

---

[18]) Dinanukt is a personified book. An entire book is devoted to him and Ditsa Zuta in *Gy* 204:20-213:6 (cf. Pognon o.c. 11, 227 n. 4, and Rudolph 1960:259 n. 3).

[19]) E. S. Drower ('E. S. Stevens'), *The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran. Their Cults, Customs, Magic Legends, and Folklore* (Oxford 1937) 180, 198.

[20]) 'Kantaeans' is the only name of a sect in this text for which there is no obvious explanation. Bar Koni's solution is analogous to the derivation of the names 'Mandaeans' and 'Mashkenaeans' in section 4b.

II. Structure and unity of Bar Koni's description

On the basis of Bar Koni's headings and certain turns of phrase used by him, the text can be arranged as shown in the following table. Sections that contain Mandaisms are marked with an asterisk.

§ 1. About the Kantaeans
§ 2. About Batay, where he came from
§ 3. * Something of his doctrine
§ 4. The heresy of the Dostaeans, taught by Ado the beggar
§ 5. * Something of their doctrine
§ 6. The heresy of the Nerigaeans

As noted above, the text as a whole begins and ends with the words 'the stupid Kantaeans', and is preceded and followed by entries of a totally different nature. The following is a systematic inventory of the various elements constituting the text and the unifying relationship between them. References from outside the text will also be noted.

§ 1. About the Kantaeans

— 'The stupid Kantaeans' recurs in section 6.

— Abel also figures in 5 and 6.

— The Nergalites may be historically related to the Nerigaeans in 6.

— Bar Koni's dating of Batay is in agreement with Michael the Syrian's dating of the Kantaeans and the Dostaeans; the latter are described in 4 and 5.

— Batay's life and doctrine are described in sections 2 and 3.

— The story of Goliath and the Philistines is not referred to in other sections, and was probably designed to refute the Kantaeans' claim to Abel.

There are links between section 1 and the following five sections.

§ 2. About Batay, where he came from

— The connections between this section and sections 1 and 3 are obvious.

— The land Gaukay also appears in a passage of the *Ginza* that has its parallel in section 5.

— It is also said of the Dostaeans in section 4 that their doctrine is derived in part from Mani.

— In the *Ginza*, an apostate appears who lays the Cross on the left shoulder of his disciples.

— The details of Batay's life are somewhat stereotypical and should not automatically be taken as historical facts.

Section 2 is organically related to sections 1 and 3, and has more distant connections with 4 and 5 and the *Ginza*, and thence with the Mandaeans as we know them from the *Ginza*.

§ 3. Something of his doctrine

— This section follows logically from the two previous ones.

— Schematically, Bar Koni's description of the Kantaeans' cosmology agrees with the well-known Gnostic myth, and with the doctrine of the Dostaeans.

— The hymn of the Son of Light is known from the *Ginza*.

— As in section 5, non-classical forms of Syriac may be seen as Mandaisms.

— In section 4, the Dostaeans are also referred to as Mandaeans.

This section connects sections 1 and 2 with sections 4 and 5. It would appear that enough indications have been accumulated to identify the Mandaeans who brought forth the *Ginza* with the Mandaeans described by Bar Koni.

§ 4. The heresy of the Dostaeans, taught by Ado the beggar

— Michael the Syrian mentions the Dostaeans together with the Kantaeans, who in their turn are described in sections 1-3.

— At least four names for Ado's family appear in Mandaic literature.

— The Dostaeans are also called Mandaeans, and a Mandaic literary text is quoted in section 3.

— Mandaic *m'škn'* is another word for *m'nd'*, the cult hut.

— Bar Koni's Nazaraeans may refer to the Mandaean *n'ṣwr'yy'*.

— Not only the Marcionites and the Manichaeans (also mentioned in section 2), but also the Kantaeans (sections 1-3) are said to have contributed to the doctrine of the Dostaeans.

— Ado's biography, like that of Batay, serves largely polemical polemical purposes.

The description of the Dostaeans follows that of the Kantaeans in sections 1-3, because a part of their doctrine is derived from the Kantaeans. This doctrine is given in section 5. The references to the Mandaeans are in agreement with what is known from the living Mandaean tradition.

§ 5. Something of their doctrine

— This section is a logical continuation of section 4.

— As in section 3, the language displays Mandaizing features.

— The story of creation has a parallel in the *Ginza*.

— The names of Hamgay, Hamgagay, Dinanos and Ditsa Zuta are familiar from Mandaic literature.

— The same is true of Abel, who is also mentioned in sections 1 and 6.

The linguistic link with section 3 is particularly striking. The contents of section 5 fit in well with familiar Gnostic and Mandaean myth.

§ 6. The heresy of the Nerigaeans

— Nerig is related to Nergal in section 1.

— Abel is also mentioned in sections 1 and 5.

— The ritual described is reminiscent of the Mandaean *laupa*.

— 'Kanta' is the source of the name Kantaeans in sections 1 and 4.

— 'The stupid Kantaeans', in combination with the same words at the beginning of section 1, provide the *inclusio*.

This section links up with the five previous ones and brings Bar Koni's description to an end. Twice, a threefold division (Kantaeans — Dostaeans — Nerigaeans and Abel — Cain — Seth) is completed and the reader is referred back to the beginning of the text.

III. Conclusion

Having analyzed the text as thoroughly as permitted by the scope of this article, and having presented the significant data in a structural overview, I shall now summarize the results and, in doing so, make a case for my view on the unity of Bar Koni's account, as well as its historical value and the date and place of origin.

In *mēmrā* XI of his *Kᵉtābā d-'eskolyon* Bar Koni presents, under the headings of the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Nerigaeans, a description of a complex of ideas, ritual and myth that may be seen — in Gerö's words — as a sample of Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosticism. This text unit stands on its own and is remarkably structured, consisting in effect of two historical expositions, followed by specimina of the doctrines under discussion. The text ends with a section that wraps up the account by naming a third sect and a third brother, and by repeating the very first words of the story.

In assessing the biographical and historical data on Batay and Ado, we must keep in mind that Bar Koni is describing heretics and heretical sects to which he is opposed. Michael the Syrian's dating of the Kantaeans and Dostaeans at the end of the fifth century is in agreement with that of Bar Koni for Batay and the Kantaeans. In the case of Ado, however, such historical evidence is lacking, and his biography as given by Bar Koni clearly contains a number of fictional elements. On the other hand, the mention of his land of origin (Adiabene) and his destination (Mayshan) seems innocent enough and may be of historical value. It is also noteworthy that Bar Koni insists on calling the Dostaeans 'Adonaeans' after Ado, while presenting five plausible alternatives. It is not clear why he does so, but this suggests that Ado was known to Bar Koni's audience and could be used to ridicule the Dostaeans. Taking into account the strong evidence that the biographies of Batay and Ado were intended to serve a polemical purpose, I believe that their historicity cannot be dismissed on the grounds of Bar Koni's data alone.

The story about Goliath and the Philistines is designed to deny the Kantaeans their claim to Abel, as Bar Koni — almost in spite of himself — admits. It is precisely the mention of Abel that bears the hallmark of authenticity, because the latter plays such an important role in Mandaean myth. It is, therefore, interesting that Bar Koni has

Abel reappear in the description of the Dostaeans, baptizing Adam. This event is fundamental to the religion of the Mandaeans.

The contents of the doctrines described by Bar Koni must then be characterized as Gnostic. This can be confirmed by comparing them with Mandaic literature. In his presentation of creation, with its tensions between Good and Evil and between power and powerlessness, Bar Koni displays a keen sense for the fundamentals of Gnosticism, rejecting it by exposing it.

Bar Koni's seemingly confused statements about the three sects together form an entity with regard to structure as well as content. The historicizing data they contain, when read in their proper context, appear to be valid and are sustained by Michael the Syrian. Thus far, evidence against the historicity of Bar Koni's description is lacking. I shall conclude with two observations which, in my view, force us to take Bar Koni at his word.

In the first place, throughout the entire text we find parallels with the known Mandaic literature and tradition. These parallels range from similarity of content (like the story of creation in section 5) and the occurrence of familiar names (e.g. Dinanos and Ditsa Zuta) to the mention of Batay, who may be the apostate described in the *Ginza*. The quotation from the hymn of the Son of Light, which appears almost verbatim in the *Ginza,* also springs to mind[21]). Bar Koni reports in the last paragraph of section 4 that the Dostaeans in Mayshan are also called Mandaeans. I believe that we are justified in taking this information seriously, and seeing the description of the three Gnostic sects in *mēmrā* XI as a usable historical account of the beginnings of Mandaeism[22]).

Secondly, both the sections 'Something of his doctrine' and 'Something of their doctrine' contain certain words, unknown in Classical Syriac, that for the most part can be explained as Mandaic. Bar Koni emphasizes one instance by the formulation 'what they call baptism'. I believe this can only mean that Bar Koni understood the words himself and expected his audience to understand them, too. Nowhere does he give any kind of translation or explanation. This detail is clearly of great linguistic interest. Moreover, it lends credence to the supposition that the language of the Mandaeans — from which Bar Koni borrowed certain elements — was very close to the language which Bar Koni himself and his readers used in daily life. This would appear to point to a date and place of origin not too far removed from the events described[23]). For this reason, Gerö's remark to the effect that in *mēmrā* XI there

[21]) Bar Koni does not mention the *Ginza* itself. He might have done so, had it been known to him, as he also gives the title of the 'Instruction against the sorceresses' in section 5. Assuming that Bar Koni is recording contemporary events, this fact may be of significance in determining a *terminus post quem* for the redaction of the *Ginza*.

[22]) As does Gerö o.c. 267 n. 8, against Rudolph 1960:31-36.

[23]) Pognon o.c. 233f., considers the non-classical words as 'patois des chrétiens du pays de Kachkar, patois qui devait ressembler beaucoup au mandaïte'. He does not, however, adduce this observation to argue for a date or place of origin of the text, the discussion of which seems to have been initiated by Gerö o.c. 266.

appears to be no mention of any events that took place after the fifth century, does not necessarily apply to the description of the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Nerigaeans. For the time being, Theodore bar Koni's report, which originated in Kashkar, Central Mesopotamia, in the last decade of the eighth century, may be considered the oldest independent outside account of the Mandaeans.

IV. Translation

The following translation is based on the Syriac text as edited by Scher o.c. 342:6-347:21. The discussion in the notes is confined mainly to the Mandaisms and a few other words which are unknown in Classical Syriac[24]). The page numbers of Scher's edition are given in square brackets, as are the emendations, and the latter are provided with references to Scher's edition or to the translations with the accompanying notes by Pognon[25]), Rudolph[26]), and Hespel and Draguet[27]). Words added to make the English read more smoothly appear in regular brackets. The section numbers used in this article appear in bold face.

Theodore bar Koni on the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Nerigaeans

1a. About the Kantaeans.

Therefore, since the stupid Kantaeans report that their doctrine has come down from Abel, it is necessary to demonstrate where it comes from.

After Goliath, the hero of the Philistines, had been killed by David, (the Philistines,) being ashamed to say that their hero had died by means of a stone from a sling, made up a story and said that a warlike man, carrying a staff of iron, had come down from the camp of the Hebrews and had struck and killed him[28]). And they made a statue for him and every year they held a festival (in commemoration) of the murder by means of a battle. While arrayed and standing opposite one another in ranks, the priests of Dagon, who were the priests of Goliath, scratched their bodies with pieces of iron and struck each other with staffs and ran after each other, as a sign of fight. And then one of them, who carried a staff of iron, approached and struck the statue and cast it down, to imitate the fall of Goliath. And at the moment

---

[24]) Unless otherwise indicated, E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *A Mandaic dictionary* (Oxford 1963) and J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford 1903, 1988) have been used.

[25]) Pognon 1898:220-228, 233-244 (French).

[26]) Rudolph 1960:255-259. (German; without the last section on the Nerigaeans).

[27]) Hespel and Draguet 1982:255-259 (French).

[28]) I Samuel 17.

of its fall they cried: 'Thus the coward killed the hero, and the weakling the mighty one!' And so they did in their country for a long time.

When Nebuchadnezzar had led the Philistines into captivity, he destroyed the statue of Goliath[29]). And when the priests of Dagon arrived at Babylon, they carved a big piece of wood in the shape of Goliath and set a piece of iron on its head by way of the helmet of Goliath. And they set themselves in array and one of the priests knelt before it and pretended to stab himself with a knife. And they cut off a big thick branch and hung nuts and edible things on it; and one of the priests carried it while he was stripped naked and [343] had girded a colourful belt around his loins. And they went out to the field and shot arrows and shouted and said: 'The arrow has flown away!' And the men together with the women cried: 'The mysteries are killed, but as for me, I am left in peace! The heroes are destroyed, but as for me, I am left in peace!', as if they were weeping over the murder of Goliath. They committed this madness in the month of Ab and in the months of Tishri.

1b. The Chaldeans, however, who had found in their signs of the zodiac an old and troublesome demon, whom they called Nergal, named this sect after him. And so this sect continued until King Yazdgard. And in the days of Peroz, Batay introduced another horror into it.

2. About Batay, where he came from.

The people of this sect (of the Kantaeans) had a leader who was called Pappa, a son of the Kalilaeans from Gaukay. And this Pappa had a slave and his name was Batay. Because of his laziness, this (Batay) fled from slavery and hid himself among the Jews, and from there he went over to the disciples of Mani. And he collected and arranged a few things out of their words and (out of) the mysteries of their sorcery. And in the days of King Peroz, when a decree came out against the idols and their priests, to ensure that only the sect of the Magi would remain, and Batay saw that his sect was coming to an end, he tried to find favour with the Magi and (began) worshipping the luminaries. And they even received fire and placed it in their houses, and he changed his name from Batay to[30]) [Yazdani], which means 'He is [from] the gods'[31]). From the Jews he stole (the precept) not to eat from the pig, and the name of the Lord God from the Torah, and from the Christians the Sign of the Cross, which he laid on the left shoulder of his hearers. And the Cross, they say, is the symbol of the boundary between the Father of Majesty and the lower region.

---

[29]) Cf. II Kings 25.

[30]) Literally 'and he changed his name from Batay and called (himself)'.

[31]) Scher o.c. 343:24; cf. Pognon o.c. 222 n. 2.

3a. [344] Something of his doctrine.

He says indeed that before everything there was one godhead and this one divided itself in two; and from it Good and Evil came into being. And the Good gathered the luminaries and the Evil the darkness. And the Evil became aware and ascended and waged war on the Father of Majesty. And the Father of Majesty knew that there would be an ordeal. And he called a voice out of him[32]), and out of this voice the Lord God was created. And also the Lord God called (in) seven voices, and seven powers came into being from Him. Then seven evil spirits ascended and bound the Lord God and the seven powers that (had come into being) from Him, and the nature of the soul they captured from the Lord God. And the demons and the evil spirits rose, seven and twelve (in number), and they made Adam, the first man. And the Lord God came and destroyed Adam and made[33]) him again.

And furthermore they say that there are ten heavens and they call them by horrible names: Ardi, they say, and Mardi, Ardabli, Sparsgal, Harbabel, Qudi, Maqdi, Lahsi and Mahsi, and Hayye, saying about him[34]) that he brought an offering from the garden of Adam: pomegranate seeds, fig tree blossoms, and dates.

3b. And furthermore they say, in the person of him whom they call the Son of Light: 'I [proceeded][35]) and drew near[36]) to[37]) the souls. And when they saw me they gathered[38]) towards me and (with) a thousand greetings they greeted me. And they wailed and they said to me: Son of Light, go and say to our Father: When will the prisoners be set free, and (when) will there be relief for the distressed who are in distress? And (when) will there be relief for the souls who bear the suffering in the world? And I spoke and I said to them: When the mouth of the Euphrates is dry, and the Tigris from its discharge is dry at all times, and (when) all the beds are leveled, then for the souls there will be relief.' This, of the abundance of the impiety of this (Batay), is enough.

4a. [345] The heresy of the Dostaeans, taught by Ado the beggar.

Ado was, as they say, from Adiabene and came as a beggar with his family to the land of Mayshan. And the name of his father was Dabda, and that of his mother Emkushta; and his brothers were Shamlay, Nadbay, Barhayye, Abizka, Kushti and

---

32) Alternative translation: 'And there called a voice out of him'. In Mandaic literature *q'l'*, 'voice', is sometimes personified (e.g. *Gy* 88:15).

33) Here, *šw'*, *pa''el* (Scher o.c. 344:13, 345:25, 346:2,6) has the meaning of 'to make', which is the usual meaning in Mandaic, whereas the Syriac would have to be translated as 'to lay even' or 'to agree'.

34) About Hayye?

35) Scher o.c. 344:20; Pognon o.c. 153:23.

36) *sg'*, *'ap'el* (Scher o.c. 344:20, 346:11) meaning 'to go' is not found in Classical Syriac, but regularly occurs in Mandaic. Here 'to draw near' has been chosen, in order to have a concordant translation for the second instance.

37) *'l* (Scher o.c. 344:21) in Syriac means 'on', 'upon', and here *l-*, 'to', would be required. In Mandaic *'l* and *l-* are used without discrimination.

38) *knp*, *p'al* (Scher o.c. 344:21) is Mandaic for 'to gather'. In Syriac, *p'al* is absent, while *pa''el* and *'ap'el* are used for 'to gather under the wings'.

Shetel. And when they reached the river Ulay, they met a man whose name was Pappa bar Tinis and they asked him for alms, according to their habit. And they persuaded him to take the slothful Ado with him, since because of his illness he was not able to go out begging. This Pappa, however, handed him over to the guards of the palm trees. But when the guards of the palm trees complained about him (saying): 'He is of no use to us', Pappa built him a booth by the side of the road so that he could beg himself a living from the passers-by. Eventually his friends gathered together and came to him. And they stood there striking their cymbals, according to the habit of beggars.

4b. In Mayshan they are called Mandaeans, and Mashkenaeans, and the people of the Benefactor. And [in] Bet Aramaye, Nazaraeans and the people of Dosti. But the name that suits them is that of Adonaeans. Now their doctrine is composed of (the doctrines of) the Marcionites, the Manichaeans and the Kantaeans.

5a. Something of their doctrine.

They say indeed that before heaven and earth had come into being, there were great powers and they rested on the water. And they had a son and they called him Abithur. And Abithur had a son and he called his name Ptahil. And they say that Abithur charged him (saying): 'Go and coagulate the earth [without][39]) rennet and extend[40]) the heaven [without] a column. Create and make mankind, one the son of the other, and blacken their heads with a handful of what is in the water and their beards with the fishes of [the sea][41]), so that they may live', he said, 'and eat (during) two hundred and seventy-two years.' And Ptahil went away [346], they say, and did not do as his father charged him, but created and made ten tribes[42]) and twelve tribes. And he gave them motion[43]), but spirit and soul he did not give them. And when Abithur, they say, sat in the seven firmaments, he lifted[44]) his eyes and saw Ptahil and said to him: 'A fetter[45]) will be upon you, Ptahil. I said: Go and make

---

[39]) Scher o.c. 345:24,25; Pognon o.c. 238.

[40]) The imperative *pʿʿal* of *ngd* (Scher o.c. 345:25) in Syriac is *gd*. The strong form *ngwd* is typical Mandaic (Macuch 1965:291f.).

[41]) The meaning of these words is obscure. Cf. Pognon o.c. 226, 237: 'blanchis leur tête plus que la vapeur des eaux et leurs barbes plus que les poissons de la mer (?)'; Rudolph 1960:258: 'wasche (? *sḥr*) ihren Kopf mit einer Handvoll (*ḥūbiā*) von den Wassern und ihre Bärte von den Fischen des Meeres' and Hespel and Draguet o.c. 258: 'noircis leur tête avec la paume (?) qui est dans les eaux, et leur barbe avec les poissons [de la mer]'.

[42]) For the two instances of *bby* (Scher o.c. 346:2) Rudolph 1960:258 n. 9 seems to propose Mandaic *b'b'*, plural *b'by'*, 'gates', 'sects' or 'tribes'.

[43]) *rpst'* (Scher o.c. 346:2) is not known either in Syriac nor Mandaic. One of the meanings of the root *rps* is 'to dance'. Nöldeke 1898:359 suggests 'zitternde Bewegung'.

[44]) In Syriac, *dl'*, *paʿʿel* (Scher o.c. 346:4) is not used for the lifting of the eyes. In Mandaic it is the regular verb, even without the eyes being expressed as an object: *d'ly't h'zy' nyšymt'*, 'The soul lifted up (her eyes) and saw' (*Gy* 99:15).

[45]) *qwt'* (Scher o.c. 346:5, 8, 9) is not known either in Syriac or Mandaic. Pognon o.c. 241 identifies it with Mandaic *gywṭ'* (root *gʿṭ*), 'shame', 'rage'. Nöldeke 1898:359 proposes Syriac *qwd'*, 'fetter'.

(mankind), one the son of the other! And he did not obey (in) one thing that I charged him!' And further they say that the Uthra[s][46]) and Ptahil rose and said to Abithur: 'This fetter, do not put it on Ptahil your son.' And he said to them: 'This fetter will rest upon Ptahil until the day of judgement and the years of redemption, when the resurrection of the death is a day and a half, and Christ draws near and comes to the world. The brick will talk from the foundation[47]) and say: 'I confess Christ'. And when he (Abithur) did not give heed, either to him or to the Uthras, the Sons of Light, he (Ptahil) went away and was silent, and he accepted the bonds of his father. And [they][48]) say that he (Abithur) threw the chain over him which is the fullness of the world[49]). And he fixed a stake in him which reached from earth to heaven. And behold, now he sits in bonds until the day of judgement and the years of redemption, until the brick talks from the foundation and says: 'I [confess] Christ'[50]).

5b. They say in their hymn, which they call 'Instruction[51]) against the Sorceresses' as follows: 'The evil spirit that is called Hamgay, and Hamgagay from the northern chain, and Mardiq and Labarnita and Tatay from Bet Huzaye, and Ani, Nani, Bel, and Belti from the land of the Romans, and Diq, Mardiq and Guztani from India, and Arnat and Aphrodite from the West, and Magarda Shalyutah from the East, and Emma and Mammani from Hirta of the Arabs, at whose head', it says, 'sits the old Ambiyu. All these', it says, 'are sorceresses.'[52]) And they have gone and with their sorceries they have killed bulls, rams, horses, [347] camels and flocks of sheep; they have dried up the seeds and the plantings until Adam, the first man. They provoked Adam and he washed away their leprosy, and they performed sorceries on Adam and placed him under hard sufferings, until Abel came and bound Adam and washed him clean; after the example of which they administer what they call 'baptism'[53]). And furthermore they speak of Dinanos, the [ink] book[54]) and of Ditsa Zuta. Also of these fabrications so far.

---

[46]) Scher o.c. 346:7; Pognon o.c. 155:4.

[47]) *'šyt'* (Scher o.c. 346:13, 19) is Mandaic for 'foundation', or 'wall', according to Th. Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik* (Halle an der Saale 1875) 113. The Syriac cognate is *'šṭ'*, 'bottom', 'deepest part'.

[48]) Scher o.c. 346:15; Pognon o.c. 242, n. 2.

[49]) For *mlyth d-'lm'* (Scher o.c. 346:16) Pognon o.c. 243 proposes Mandaic *ml'yy' ḏ-'lm'*, an expression used to indicate something extremely large or voluminous (cf. Hebrew *'yr gdwlh l-'lhym* in Jonah 3:3).

[50]) Scher o.c. 346:19f.; Pognon o.c. 242 n. 1.

[51]) *'drkt'* (Scher o.c. 346:20) is not known either in Syriac or Mandaic. The translation is based on the supposition that the word is an *'ap'el*-formation of *drk*, 'to apprehend', 'to understand'.

[52]) After a repeated *lm*, the quotation seems to end here and to be continued in paraphrase. The last sentences of this paragraph are certainly Bar Koni's own words (as noted by Hespel and Draguet o.c. 258f.).

[53]) *mṣbw'yt'* (Scher o.c. 347:6) closely resembles Mandaic *mṣbwṭ'*, 'baptism'. In Syriac the root *'md* is used: *m'mwdyt'*. Cf. Bar Bahlul: *mṣbw'yt' (...) ḥlp m'mwdyt'* (R. Duval (ed.), *Lexicon Syriacum auctore Hassano Bar Bahlule,* vol. 1-3 (Paris 1901) 1137:13).

[54]) Scher o.c. 347:6f.; Rudolph 1960:259; 259 n. 3.

6. The heresy of the Nerigaeans.

The heresy of these people comes down from Cain. After the death of Cain, his sons came together and said: 'The spirit of Cain our father has no rest on earth, because he must be shaking and trembling[55]) on account of his murder of Abel'. And they made a shrine and arranged food on it, so that the spirit of Cain might indeed come and stay on it. And the sons of Cain came together at that shrine for a lamentation, and they called Cain their father (by) the name of Nerig, because they said that their father longed for rest (*n^{e}yāḥā rā'eg*). This is Cain, whom his sons call Nerig.

And the sons of Seth, they also came together and said: 'Let us, too, make a resort to Abel the brother of our father'. And they made (it) and called it 'Warning' (*kuwwānā*) because they say: 'He is a warning to us'. This is the Kanta of the stupid Kantaeans.

Bibliography

Gerö 1987 — S. Gerö, Ophite Gnosticism according to Theodore Bar Koni's Liber Scholiorum, in: *IV Symposium Syriacum* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229; Roma 1987) 265-74.

Hespel and Draguet 1982 — R. Hespel and R. Draguet (transl.), *Théodore bar Koni. Livre des Scholies (recension de Séert)*, vol. 1, *Mimrè I-V* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 431/Scriptores Syri 187; Louvain 1981); vol. 2, *Mimrè VI-XI* (CSCO 432/Syr. 188; Louvain 1982).

Jonas 1963 — H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity,* second rev. ed. (Boston 1958, 1963).

Macuch 1965 — R. Macuch, *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic* (Berlin 1965).

Nöldeke 1898 — Th. Nöldeke, H. Pognon. *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir, WZKM* 12 (1898) 353-61 [review].

Pognon 1898 — H. Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris 1898).

Rudolph 1978 — K. Rudolph, *Mandaeism* (Iconography of Religions. Sect. 21; Leiden 1978).

Rudolph 1960 and 1961 — K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer,* vol. 1, *Prolegomena: Das Mandäerproblem* (Göttingen 1960); vol. 2, *Der Kult (*Göttingen 1961).

Scher 1912 — A. Scher (ed.), *Theodorus bar Koni. Liber Scholiorum,* vol. 1 (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium/Scriptores Syri s2 65; Paris, Leipzig 1910 = CSCO 55/Syr. 19); vol. 2 (CSCO/Syr. s2 66; Paris, Leipzig 1912 = CSCO 68/Syr. 26).

[55]) Cf. Gen. 4:12, 14 in the Peshitta version.

SUMMARY

Theodore bar Koni's description of the sects of the Kantaeans, the Dostaeans and the Nerigaeans in his *Kᵉtābā d-ʾeskolyon* (ed. Scher 1912 [CSCO/Syr. s2 66 = CSCO 68/Syr. 26] 342:6-347:21) is subjected to a systematic reading. The doctrines described must be characterized as Gnostic. Parallels are adduced from Mandaic literature, tradition, and language. It is argued that the section in which Bar Koni describes these various sects constitutes a unity. In addition, it is maintained that Theodore's report, which originated in Kashkar, Central Mesopotamia, in the last decade of the eighth century, may be considered the oldest independent outside account of the Mandaeans. An English translation of the Syriac text, together with notes on the Mandaisms it contains, is given at the end of the article and serves as the basis for the discussion.